•		
. 1	SUPREME COURT: NEW YORK COUNTY TRIAL TERM: PART 93	
.2	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK	*
3		IND.#: 05643/2007
4		
5	-against-	CHARGE: CSCS1
6	EDWARD GREEN	
7	Defendant.	SENTENCE
. 8	x	
. , 9	MSID # 1386617 R Centre St	reet
10	New York, New	York 10013
11	October 8, 20	0.8
12	Occober 0, 20	
13	BEFORE: HONORABLE EDWARD J.	
14	Justice of the Supre	me Court
15	APPEARANCES:	
16	FOR THE PEOPLE:	
. 17		f ,
18	ROBERT MORGENTHAU, ESQ. New York County District	Attorney
19	One Hogan Place New York, New York 10013	
20	BY: JASON BERLAND, ESQ. Assistant District Attorne	e.
21		
22	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	
23	HORNSTEIN, PALUMBO & KEITH Attorneys for the Defendar BY: ARNOLD KEITH, ESQ.	
24	WILL ARROUD RETTH, ESQ.	
.25	The second second	

. 1	THE CLERK: Calendar Number 2,
2	Indictment 5643 of 2007, as to Edward
. 3	Green.
4	Appearances
5	MR. BERLAND: Jason Berland for the
6	People.
7	Good afternoon.
8	MR. GREEN: For Mr. Green, Arnold
9	Keith, Hornstein, Palumbo & Keith.
10	Good afternoon.
11	THE COURT: Hello.
12	The defendant has filed apparently a
13	pro se motion asking that the verdict be
14	undone.
15	Have you seen that?
16	MR. KEITH: I just saw it, your
17 ·	Honor.
18	MR. BERLAND: I have seen it, your
19	Honor.
20	THE COURT: It's a long description
21	about laboratories in the past and there's a
22.	complaint about the lawyer with respect to
23	certain things that happened during the
24	course of the trial.
25	Is there anything you want to say,
1	

1 Mr. Berland?
2 MR

17.

MR. BERLAND: I am prepared, if your Honor wishes, to address the motion now or if you want something in writing since I just did receive it on Monday, I could do that as well. However your Honor wishes to proceed.

THE COURT: I don't think there is a necessity of having anything in writing.

I wanted to know if you wanted to make any oral comment. If you don't, that's fine.

MR. BERLAND: Briefly.

As far as the ineffective assistance of counsel claim, I don't believe this is the proper vehicle, the 330.30 motion.

I think it would be a post judgment 440 motion which would be more appropriate considering ineffective assistance of counsel.

Also, as your Honor is aware, often there are facts outside of the record.

Although I just took a quick glance at this, I did just receive it, I don't

believe it's a proper vehicle.

22.

With that being said, my quick glance of the motion, it indicated that the defendant's complaints were with Mr. Keith's trail strategy, and that's exactly what it was, a strategy. I don't believe it's ineffective assistance of counsel.

So that's really all I would like to say as far as that claim.

The defendant did make mention that certain of the laboratory reports that were entered into evidence in the Grand Jury were defective because they weren't containing a transmittal memorandum.

In fact, on December 12th of 2007, the VDF was turned over with the control lab reports which were introduced into evidence in the Grand Jury and they have that transmittal memorandum stamped on them.

I think that is a moot issue.

I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Keith, if you want to say anything.

MR. KEITH: Well, your Honor, certainly during the course of the trial

there were statements and decisions that I made which the court ruled unfavorable to Mr. Green, and an argument can certainly be made that there was ineffective assistance of counsel.

THE COURT: But he doesn't make it because -- he doesn't complain about those things.

What he says is that somebody put all their eggs so-to-speak in the basket of the court, so the court would order a trial order of dismissal at the close of the People's case, for the reasons that you stated a couple of times on the side.

That after that you had no other strategy, which I find difficult to accept.

But the things about which you made reference are not listed in his motion.

MR. KEITH: Yes, your Honor. I haven't had an opportunity to carefully analyze his motion. I know that the bulk of it refers to laboratory analysis and, you know, during the trial we had stipulated as to the substances being controlled substances.

. 1	But I certainly agree that Mr. Green
2	was denied a fair trial, and I certainly will
3	file a notice of appeal on his behalf when he
4.	is sentenced.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6,	You wanted to say something else?
7	MR. KEITH: Yes.
8	I would join in his motion to vacate
9	the jury's decision and state that because of
10	the rulings that were made during the trial
11	and because of various statements I may have
12	made, various arguments I may have made, and
13	the overall content of the trial, I think a
14	motion to set aside the verdict would be
15	appropriate and I am asking your Honor to do
16	so.
17	THE COURT: It's denied.
18	So that's appealable as well.
19	Is there a predicate felony statement
20	you need to file?
21	Please discuss that with Mr. Green.
22	When you are ready, ask the Clerk to ask the
23	questions and then we'll move forward.
24	(Brief pause in proceedings.)
25	THE COURT: Go ahead.

1.	THE CLERK: Edward Green, a statement
.2	has been made by the District Attorney's
3	office alleging that you have previously been
4	convicted of a felony.
5	The statement sets forth the date and
6	place of each felony conviction.
7	Have you been given a copy of that
8	statement?
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
10	THE CLERK: The statement reads as
11.	follows:
12	On October 8th, 1996, in the Supreme
13	Court of New York County, in the State of New
14	York, the defendant was convicted of the
15	felony of attempted criminal sale of a
16	controlled substance in the third degree,
17	Penal Law Section 220.39. The ten year
18	period referred to in Penal Law Section
19	70.06, subsection 1(b), is extended by the
20	defendant's incarceration in federal custody
21	from October 8th, 1996 to February 13th,
22	2001.
23	Mr. Green, if you wish to dispute any
24	charges made in that statement, you must
25	specify a particular charge.

## Proceedings

1.	If you do not, those charges will be
2	deemed admitted by you.
3	Do you wish to dispute any charge
4	made in that statement?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
6	THE CLERK: Do you wish to challenge
. 7	the constitutionality of that conviction?
8	MR. KEITH: He is not challenging.
9	THE COURT: So the defendant is a
10	second felony offender.
11	Mr. Berland, do you know why he was.
12	in federal as opposed to state custody?
13	Is that something that is not to be
14	disclosed?
15	MR. BERLAND: Your Honor, all I know
16	is that the July '96 conviction was for a
17	federal crime. He was already in federal
18	custody at the time that he was convicted of
19	the state crime, the attempted sale.
20	THE COURT: All right.
Ź1	MR. BERLAND: I don't know if that
22	answers directly your question. That is the
23	information I have.
24	THE COURT: So we're now going to go
25.	to sentencing.

5.

1.1

1.3

Mr. Green, you have a right to speak on the issue of the appropriate sentence within the range that the law allows.

You could speak, you could ask Mr.

Keith to speak in addition to or instead of what you may wish to say.

I will hear what you want to do after the People.

MR. BERLAND: Your Honor, the People recommend the sentence of eighteen years.

As I mentioned during the Sandoval portion prior to the beginning of the trial, the defendant has a criminal record dating back to the 1960's and recently or most recently than some of the older cases that I mentioned during the Sandoval application, and your Honor has the rap sheets of the defendant, are the October 8th, 1996 attempted criminal sale of a controlled substance in the third degree, where he sold cocaine to an undercover officer and received three to six years.

On July 1st of 1996 was the federal conviction where he was found guilty of possessing a shotgun during drug trafficking.

In that case he received five years.

11.

And back in 1982, the violent B felony of attempted kidnapping in the first degree, where the defendant abducted a kid by the name of Woodrow Sultan with intent to compel that individual's mother's sister or whichever, it's not clear, to pay a sum of money for the victim's release.

Your Honor, it appears that the only times that the defendant isn't committing crimes are when he is incarcerated.

His record is extremely lengthy.

In this case he was convicted by a jury after trial. It took them a few hours to reach a verdict.

Based on the nature of this case, based on his lengthy criminal history, I think that a significant jail sentence is appropriate, and the People are recommending eighteen years.

THE COURT: Mr. Green, Mr. Keith.

MR. KEITH: Your Honor, first of all, with regard to the probation report, there are a couple of items that I would like to correct.

In the description of the offense, it indicates that on Mr. Green's person there was a set of keys that could access both of the rooms in question, and I think the evidence made it unequivocally clear that he only had a key for the fourth floor apartment and not for the second floor apartment and I would just like that portion of the probation report to reflect that.

Additionally, the probation report indicates that he is a multi-state offender, and that is incorrect. He has one out of state conviction and that was for a weapons charge and that was a federal conviction.

In that case he was sentenced to sixty months and that time period ran concurrent with the New York State conviction for the drug sale.

The assistant characterizes Mr. Green as having a lengthy record. His record covers a long period of time. The fact of the matter remains there are only three felony convictions.

The kidnapping, what it was was a personal matter and that is from over thirty

l

. 7

years ago, and then the drug sale and the federal gun charge, and the rest of his record is relatively minor. It's not an extensive criminal history, but it does cover a long period of time.

Having said that, your Honor, Mr.

Green is 58 years old and the trial that we experienced was a challenging endeavor, to say the least. I had to, as they say, fall on the sword. I made some statements and made some decisions that led to some adverse rulings by your Honor that substantially hurt Mr. Green during the trial.

As I have said before, this trial was based on the testimony of police officers that your Honor correctly concluded acted illegally on the day in question.

And the statements, sworn statements that were made at the time of the issuance of the first search warrant affidavit, at the time of the Grand Jury presentation, at the time of the hearing that your Honor conducted and at the time of the second search warrant affidavit and at trial, were inconsistent.

And it's clear beyond dispute that

б

Officer Romero, in particular, gave perjurious testimony and inconsistent statements directly to your Honor and to the jury in this case.

Mr. Green certainly was denied a fair trial and I pray that he will have success on his appeal.

But having said that, your Honor, with regard to sentencing and the punishment that you must give Mr. Green, the minimum sentence available to Mr. Green convicted of the A-1 felony is twelve years.

your Honor, he is 58 years old and even if we assume the worse, that he was either holding drugs for someone or involved in the drug trade in some way, a twelve year sentence for a 58 year old man I would think is more than appropriate under the circumstances of this case and with the legal issues that have been raised by what has happened from the beginning of this case to the time of his conviction.

Your Honor has not had the opportunity to learn much about Mr. Green other than what's been alleged and the

information I contained in my moving papers and the information that is in the probation report. I have talked to this man on numerous occasions and, your Honor, for what it's worth, he impresses me as a man with above average intelligence.

I have learned about his family. He is married to a devoted wife. He has children and grandchildren. He is a father and grandfather. All indications are that at the time of this incident he was, in fact, working at that building. The keys certainly suggest that he had access to just about every apartment and the laundromat at that location.

Your Honor, I'm asking you to be merciful. I am concerned about the appellate process and what will happen here. I am hopeful that there will be success. But in terms of punishment that your Honor is about to impose, it seems to me that the minimum sentence of the twelve year sentence is more than appropriate under all of the facts and circumstances of this case.

THE COURT: Anything Mr. Green wants

Theresa Magniccari Senior Court Reporter

1	to say?
2	MR. KEITH: Mr. Green does not wish
3	to speak.
4	One moment.
5	(Brief pause.)
6	MR. KEITH: Your Honor, Mr. Green
7	asked me to ask your Honor if you would
8	consider setting a bail pending appeal.
9	THE COURT: No.
10	You wanted to say something?
11	MR. BERLAND: Briefly, something that
12	Mr. Keith mentioned that I take issue with.
13	He stated that it is clear beyond
14	dispute that Detective Romero perjured
15	himself during this trial, and the People
16	want to place on the record that we
17	wholeheartedly dispute this baseless
18	allegation.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	All right.
21	I made certain findings during the
22	course of what is known as the Darden
23	Hearing. They stand.
24	Now we have to impose the sentence,
25	and these are the reasons why the sentence is

going to be imposed:

The legal issues that have been referred to did not exist on the date that the crime was committed.

I don't have any doubt whatsoever that you had possession of the drugs, as New York defines possession, given your access to them, given the amount of money that those drugs were worth and the location and the circumstances under which you were found.

Certainly, you do get some benefit for having survived to be 58 years old. I am not much past that and that's a life work in itself, but what you have done with your life is distressing.

As far back as when you were 18 years of age, apparently you comitted some kind of a robbery. You were given what is known as youthful offender treatment, which means non-jail, and then for some reason you fouled up and got four years. Then you did the kidnapping for "personal reasons," whatever that is. Then you had one or two drug felony convictions.

. 1	So it is with a significant amount of
2	salt that we take your denial that you were
3	not involved or had any involvement in this
4	situation.
5	With respect to the A-1 felony,
6	which only a few years ago would have
7	gotten you a life sentence, the sentence is
8	that you should serve fifteen years
9	determinate.
10	With respect to the B felony
11	conviction, twelve years determinate
12	concurrent with the fifteen that I imposed on
1.3	the A-1 felony.
14	With regard to the A-1 felony, there
15	is a mandated five year post release
16	supervision which I am imposing.
17	With respect to the B felony, a
18	concurrent three year post release
19	supervision.
20	On each of the two misdemeanor
21	charges, you are sentenced to one year
22	each.
23	Those by law merge with the
24	determinate sentences that have been
25	imposed.

1	You're mandated to receive a total of
2	\$320 in crime victim, DNA and mandated
3	surcharges.
. 4	I am sure there is an appeal.
5	We'll all wait to read about it
6	together.
7	Advise him of his right to appeal.
8	MR. KEITH: I certainly will,
9	your Honor, and I will file the notice of
10	appeal.
11	Thank you.
12	MR. BERLAND: Thank you, your
13	Honor.
14	* * * *
15	Certified to be a true and accurate
16	transcription of the minutes taken in the
17	above-captioned matter
18	$\mathcal{H}$ $\mathcal{M}$
19	- / Nun / /
20	THERESA MAGNICCARI
21	Senior Court Reporter
22	
23	
24	
25	
1	